

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 94 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #264
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 16 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 264

Today's Topics:

 440 in So. Cal.
 Getting started
 Railroad track as an antenna?
 Repeater Etquette

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 94 04:38:55 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!
skyld!jangus@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <rogjdCrGFKr.9w1@netcom.com> rogjd@netcom.com writes:

> Jeffrey D. Angus (jangus@skyld.grendel.com) wrote:
>
> [conveniently snips the top half of my comments regarding time licensed]
>
> : And on your time vs Jay's time licensed as radio amateurs, so what?
> : I always ask people when they start the dick-size wars about years of
> : experience; "Is that XX number of years doing something? Or just ONE
> : year of bad habits repeated XX times?"
>
> Obviously your reading skills are not up to speed. Your tirade is
> directed at the wrong guy, pal. I'm the one who said years of tenure in

> the hobby is of no importance. Re read the thread, if you please.

It was directed at you Roger. Plain and simple. You started the business about tenure. And it certainly has a lot to do with understanding what is currently being done. Without an understanding of history, people will be doomed to repeat it.

> : So what are you going to do Roger. Whine? Jam? File a lawsuit? Hacksaw
> : a few cables? Point the finger at everyone else and bitch some more?
>
> Buddy, don't EVER hint that I would ever be a party to jamming.

You've been going on about alledgedly bogus coordination here in the Los Angeles area for quite some time. You have made remarks that could be construed by others to suggest your being less than cooperative about who is using a frequency. Hey, if the shoe fits, you get to play the fox for the local direction finder freaks.

> : Grow some balls, take the initiative and form a 440 coordination group
> : of your own. If perchance you can keep focused on the goals and objectives
> : for more than a week or two and by some stroke of luck you avoid getting
> : any major lawsuits before you re-allocate (successfully) several "unused"
> : channel pairs, and finally you manage to gain the support of those in the
> : area/community you claim to serve, then (and only then) will you have done
> : anything worth talking about.
>
> What a crummy paragraph. Full of obscenity and all kinds of insulting
> garbage. No comment is appropriate. If you'd like to politely re-state
> any suggestions you have, I'll talk to you, but not if you are going to
> foam at the mouth in this fashion.

Balls obscene? I didn't use the phrase in any way that could be taken to be obscene. Impolite perhaps, but not obscene. I only counted one word of questionable heritage out the eighty three in the part you quoted. Where's the rest of the obscenities?

> By the way, give us all a break and leave out all the drivel regarding
> your opinions regarding the current state of the country, etc. Stick to
> the thread and leave the other slop over in alt.politics.misc.
>
> 73

I did. You've been raving about the politics of coordination. Part and parcel of that is affected by how society at large acts. Amateur radio is but a small cross section of the general population.

If the best you can do is ignore half of the post, threaten me, find fault with my grammer and make off handed remarks then I say that you

are the one lacking the "Clue" as they say.

Lead, follow or get out of the way. In case you missed it Roger, (And I'll type slow and spell check it for you) "What are you going to do?" Personally I'll place my bets on more and whining.

> : 73 es GM from Jeff
> 73 to you, too, buddy.

73 es GE to one and all, deserving or not.

Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NOAM	"You have a flair for adding
Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com	a fanciful dimension to any
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749	story."
Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080	Peking Noodle Co.

Hate "Green Card Lottery"? Want to help curb ignorant crossposting on Usenet?
E-mail ckeroack@hamp.hampshire.edu for more information, or read news.groups.

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 1994 05:44:13 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
lfloyd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Getting started
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Menachem Galatz DC (mgalatz@panix.com) wrote:
: Hi. I have a basic question. Do I have to learn morse code to get started
: in Amateur Radio?

: Thanks

: mgalatz@panix.com

Menachem,

No, you do not have to learn the code to get one of the FCC (USA) amateur licenses. Although the license you can get without learning morse code (no-code technician) is rather limited in privileges, it is a good place to get your feet wet.

Best of luck,

Larry - WB5HHM

Date: 16 Jun 94 06:47:43 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!torn!spartan.ac.BrockU.CA!
s9898198@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Railroad track as an antenna?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have heard a legend that a college radio station (either at MIT, Tufts, or Swarthmore) welded antenna to railroad tracks, and peeved the FCC by broadcasting nationwide. Is this true? If anyone knows, please email me (or post here) If you do know, could you please direct me to some documentation regarding this legend if you can.

This is very important! Thanks in advance.

James R. Storm |
Accounting Student | This message was brought to you by
s9898198@sandcastle.cosc.brocku.ca | the letters M, Q, and the number 6
(905) 227-9571 voice

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 20:21:09 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!news.ysu.edu!malgudi.oar.net!witch!
ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Repeater Etquitte
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun14.193801.1@ccsua.ctstateu.edu>, Paul Bourque
(bourque_par@ccsua.ctstateu.edu) writes:

>Hello all,

>

>I am new to this hobby (I have passed the tech. tests and now an painfully
>awaiting the ticket to show up, and drooling over my new HT cause I cant use it)
>and would like to know if there is any info available on "Repeater Etquitte". I
>have been monitoring the 2M repeaters in Central Ct and would like to know what
>the proper procedures for a QSO are, as well as how to join an allready existing
>QSO without pissing other hams off. These types of things are what I am looking
>for.

>

Since my wife got her ticket recently I know that the ARRL sends out a booklet on repeater operation to new licensees. The safest thing to do, though, is listen a lot, because customs vary throughout the country. For example, here in northern CA "break" is used much more than the last 2-3 letters of your call to break into a QSO, but, from what I've

read, in other places "break" is used for high priority traffic only, and is considered a blunder otherwise.

The best way to join an existing QSO is to have some information that the other people would find interesting. Whether they're talking about antennas, restaurants or peanut farming, maybe you have a tidbit you can offer. Here, I would do that by saying "comment" between their transmissions. The other side of the coin is to ask a reasonable question on their topic, allowing them to show off their knowledge (I would say "question?"). I think it's better (and easier) to remember the name of the person you're talking to than the call, but that's just my opinion. Each repeater has a personality, so listen a lot and you'll figure out where you want to talk, and how they do things.

Good luck, have fun, and 73,
Mike, KK6GM

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 1994 04:42:35 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
rogjd@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2tjdrv\$82t@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <rogjdCrE208.205@netcom.com>,
<joejarreCrH0ov.EJw@netcom.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Joe Jarrett (joejarre@netcom.com) wrote:
: Roger Buffington (rogjd@netcom.com) wrote:

: : Let's have cites, Jay. Cite the cases. I keep hearing you talk about
: : all the vast experience you've had in your 10 years as a ham with
: : lawsuits, etc. Cite the cases for us so that we can research the
: : validity of your claims. I've never heard of any lawsuits regarding
: : repeater coordination. Cites, please.

: Hi, Roger. In the lawsuit Jay is talking about, I personally and the
: Texas VHF-FRM Society in general was sued over issues originally stemming
: from a coordination problem. I will not iron any of the dirty laundry
: here with details; they are mostly boring anyway. But the compelling
: facts of the lawsuit stemmed from a repeater trustee who was told by his
: local FCC field office in writing that he had "primary" responsibility to
: solve a serious interference problem with another repeater. The reason
: he had the so called primary responsibility was because the local
: frequency coordinator, a volunteer agent of the Texas VHF-FM Society,
: informed the FCC (when requested) about which repeater was coordinated
: and which was not. The one who was not got the "promary responsibility"

: letter. Shortly there after, the lawsuit was filed. The lawsuit was
: technically a slander suit, but it was real never the less.

: Jay is telling you the truth.

ONE CASE.....

Jay's thesis, which he has repeated over and over and over and over again
on this thread, is that any attempt to rock the boat of the established
trustees of a given coordinated area will result in the boat-rocker's
being sued.

"Their butts will get sued off" is I believe what he said.

That is not the truth.

One example of someone waving around the threat of a lawsuit is far, far,
different from the scenario being presented to the rest of us as fact by
Jay.

Maybe Jay found it to be a scarring experience. Beats me. But the way he
uses this argument in this thread is outrageous. It is not admirable.

Frankly, from what I can get out of you guys in Texas, it seems pretty
clear that the issues you deal with there have little or nothing in common
with the issues present here in Southern California. Which is what this
thread was originally about. I guess what is so galling about Jay's
approach is that he starts with this ignorance and then blithly proceeds
to lecture and make condescending remarks to those of us who are here, and
who do know the situation.

Jay's "you'll get your butt sued off if you don't agree with me" approach
is not supported by the facts. It lacks validity.

--

rogjd@netcom.com
Glendale, CA
AB6WR

Date: Thu, 16 Jun 1994 03:36:30 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
joejarre@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CSLE87-100694173103@145.39.1.10>, <2tjdrv\$82t@nyx10.cs.du.edu> ,

<rogjdCrE208.205@netcom.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Roger Buffington (rogjd@netcom.com) wrote:

: Let's have cites, Jay. Cite the cases. I keep hearing you talk about
: all the vast experience you've had in your 10 years as a ham with
: lawsuits, etc. Cite the cases for us so that we can research the
: validity of your claims. I've never heard of any lawsuits regarding
: repeater coordination. Cites, please.

Hi, Roger. In the lawsuit Jay is talking about, I personally and the Texas VHF-FRM Society in general was sued over issues originally stemming from a coordination problem. I will not iron any of the dirty laundry here with details; they are mostly boring anyway. But the compelling facts of the lawsuit stemmed from a repeater trustee who was told by his local FCC field office in writing that he had "primary" responsibility to solve a serious interference problem with another repeater. The reason he had the so called primary responsibility was because the local frequency coordinator, a volunteer agent of the Texas VHF-FM Society, informed the FCC (when requested) about which repeater was coordinated and which was not. The one who was not got the "primary responsibility" letter. Shortly thereafter, the lawsuit was filed. The lawsuit was technically a slander suit, but it was real never the less.

Jay is telling you the truth.

--

* Joe Jarrett, K5F0G | This area *
* joejarre@netcom.com | intentionally left blank *
* Information Storage Devices FAE | *
* Austin, Texas | *

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #264
